Holly C. Wells Mara E. Michaletz Zoe A. Danner Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot 510 L Street, Suite 700 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 hwells@bhb.com mmichaletz@bhb.com zdanner@bhb.com Telephone: 907.276.1550

Facsimile: 907.276.3680

Attorneys for Appellants

IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

| SUNNY GUERIN, ELIZABETH ASISAUN TOOVAK, and VERA LINCOLN, | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Appellants, | |
| V | Supreme Court Case No. S |
| KEVIN MEYER, in his official capacity as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Alaska; GAIL FENUMIAI, in her official capacity as the Director of the Alaska Division of Elections, and the STATE OF ALASKA, DIVISION OF ELECTIONS, | |
| Appellee. |))) |

NOTICE OF APPEAL AND STATEMENT OF POINTS ON APPEAL

COME NOW Appellants Sunny Guerin, Elizabeth Asisaun Toovak, and Vera Lincoln, by and through undersigned counsel, and pursuant to Alaska Rule of Appellate Procedure 216.5(b) and 202(a), hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska from the decision entered by the Superior Court, Third Judicial District at Anchorage, titled Order on Motion for Summary Judgment and Cross-

GUERIN, ET AL. V. STATE OF ALASKA NOTICE OF APPEAL AND STATEMENT OF POINTS ON APPEAL

Trial Court No. 3AN-22-06795 CI

CASE NO. S-PAGE 1 OF 4 Motion for Summary Judgment dated June 24, 2022.

Pursuant to Alaska Rule of Appellate Procedure 204(e), Appellants hereby

state their points on appeal as follows:

1. The superior court erred by granting summary judgment to Appellees the

Division of Elections ("DOE" or the "Division"), Kevin Meyer, and Gail Fenumiai.

2. The superior court erred by applying time periods contained in AS

15.25.100(c) to the 2022 special election despite express language in that statute

applying such time periods to "general elections" and AS 15.40.140, which prescribed

the time period, and thus corresponding deadlines, for special elections.

3. The superior court erred in failing to require the Division to provide

notice of its imposition of the 64-day general election deadline contained in AS

15.25.100(c).

4. The superior court erred by failing to find the Division's failure to fill the

vacancy as required by AS 15.25.100(c) due to general election deadlines contained

in that statute.

5. The Division violated AS 15.25.100(c) by finding that the plain language

of AS 15.25.100(c), AS 15.40.140, and AS 15.40.220 did not delegate authority to the

Division to enforce its own candidate withdrawal deadline where the Division

concedes it has discretion to, and did, establish such deadline fewer than 64 days

from the date of the 2022 Special Election.

6. The superior court erred in failing to consider the impairment of the

constitutional and statutory rights of voters that will result from the Division's improper

and inconsistent interpretation of Alaska Statute Title 15, direct violation of Title 15 provisions, and failure to provide proper notice of the Division's election deadlines.

- 7. The superior court erred in failing to consider the impairment of the constitutional and statutory rights of candidates resulting from a lack of notice by the Division regarding its application of general election time deadlines to special elections.
- 8. The superior court erred in failing to consider that the Division disregarded other deadlines applicable to general elections, such as the June 1 candidate filing deadline established by AS 15.25.040, when it utilized its discretion to establish controlling deadlines for the 2022 Special Election.
- 9. The superior court did not properly weigh the substantial harm and voter confusion that results from the Division's incorrect interpretation of AS 15.25.100(c) and violations of related Alaska Statutes against the Division's ability to quickly remedy the harm by placing the candidate receiving the fifth highest number of votes on the ballot in accordance with AS 15.25.100(c).
- 10. The superior court erred in failing to consider the consequences of permitting to the Division to interpret its statutory authority inconsistently.
- 11. The superior court erred in rejecting the arguments raised throughout the pleadings filed by Plaintiffs in the expedited lower court proceeding as well as those raised in oral argument that arose from the Division's misinterpretation and resulting violation of Title 15.

DATED this 24th day of June, 2022.

BIRCH HORTON BITTNER & CHEROT

By: /s/ Holly C. Wells

Holly C. Wells, ABA #0511113 Mara E. Michaletz, ABA #0803007 Zoe A. Danner, ABA #1911094